

**KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP**

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

**WASHINGTON HARBOUR, SUITE 400**

**3050 K STREET, NW**

**WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007-5108**

(202) 342-8400

NEW YORK, NY

CHICAGO, IL

STAMFORD, CT

PARSIPPANY, NJ

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

AFFILIATE OFFICES

MUMBAI, INDIA

FACSIMILE

(202) 342-8451

www.kelleydrye.com

STEVEN A. AUGUSTINO

DIRECT LINE: (202) 342-8612

EMAIL: saugustino@kelleydrye.com

June 13, 2008

**VIA ECFS**

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Notice of *Ex Parte* Presentation, InterCall, Inc.,  
Appeal of a Decision of the Universal Service Administrative Company,  
WC Docket No. 96-45


Dear Ms. Dortch:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, the undersigned counsel hereby provides notice that on June 13, 2008, InterCall's attorneys met with Wayne Leighton, Special Advisor, Wireless & International, in the Office of Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate, in the proceeding identified above. In attendance on behalf of InterCall, Inc. were Brad E. Mutschelknaus and Steven A. Augustino of Kelley Drye & Warren LLP.

In the meeting we discussed InterCall's Request for Review of a Decision of the Universal Service Administrator and InterCall's Petition for Stay, both filed in WCB Docket 96-45. The positions presented were consistent with those InterCall presented on the record.

In addition the attached materials were distributed at the meeting.

Sincerely,



Steven A. Augustino

KELLEY

---

DRYE

# InterCall, Inc.

Review of USAC Administrator's Decision

June 13, 2008

# About InterCall

- Subsidiary Of West Corporation, a Leading Provider of Outsourced Communications Solutions Including Customer Acquisition, Customer Care, Emergency Communications and Conferencing Services
- Not a Telecommunications Carrier; Does Not Own Transmission Facilities
- Purchases Toll-free Services From IXC's as an End User of Telecom
  - InterCall paid over \$20 million in carrier USF surcharges from 2005-2007

---

KELLEY

DRYE

# InterCall's Appeal and Petition for Stay

- In This Proceeding, InterCall Seeks:
  - **Reversal** of USAC Conclusion that InterCall provides "Toll Teleconferencing"
    - USAC's decision violates 54.702(c)
    - The 499A Revision cannot add new filers
    - Audio bridging is not a telecom service
    - Stand alone audio bridging providers contribute indirectly as end users
  - **Stay** of the USAC Instruction to File 499s
    - Cannot single out InterCall in the industry
    - Retroactive application would harm InterCall
  - A Stay will Preserve the Status Quo

---

KELLEY

DRYE

# Commenters

- Stand Alone Audio Bridging Providers
  - Premiere, Genesys, Canopco, Telespan Publishing Corporation
- Integrated Audio Bridging Providers (IXCs)
  - AT&T, Qwest, Verizon

---

KELLEY

DRYE

# The Comments Validate InterCall's Factual Claims

## ➤ **All Commenters Agreed**

- Stand alone providers have operated as end users for decades
- IXC's treat stand alone providers as end users today
- An industry-wide solution is appropriate

## ➤ **No commenter supports retroactive USF assessments on stand alone providers**

- Verizon "takes no position" on retroactivity but argues only for prospective changes
- All others oppose retroactive application of USF

---

KELLEY

DRYE

## All But One Commenter Agree That Audio Bridging Is Not A Telecom Service

- Stand Alone Providers Agree with InterCall that Audio Bridging is not a Telecom Service
- AT&T Distinguishes the Transmission from the "Audio Bridging Service" (Though it Pays on Both)
- Only Verizon Contends that Audio Bridging is Telecom
  - *But Verizon Ignores:*
    - *Qwest v. Farmers* (conferencing providers are end users under tariffs)
    - Enforcement Bureau's 2004-05 Reseller Survey
    - The absence of transfer of control, CPNI certifications, etc. regarding audio bridging services

---

KELLEY

DRYE



# Verizon's Cases Are Inapposite

- AT&T "Picture Messaging Service" (1982)
  - Service was a rudimentary point-to-point video transmission service; it did not involve bridging
  - "Conferencing" component was classified as customer equipment, not a telecom service
- CALEA Order (1999)
  - Switch-based three-way calling is not equivalent to bridging
- E-Rate Eligible Services List
  - Classifications are for priority of reimbursement only; Other non-telecom services can be reimbursed as "telecommunications services"
  - In any event, only the telecommunications component of a conferencing service is eligible

---

KELLEY

DRYE



## **USAC's Decision Is Not The Correct Vehicle To Address The Policy And Legal Issues**

- The FCC, Not USAC, Must Decide if Audio Bridging is a Telecom Service
  - Classification as a telecom service imposes many regulatory burdens wholly unrelated to USF (entry/exit regulation, tariffing, CPNI, etc.)
- The FCC, Not USAC, Must Provide Guidance to Stand Alone and Integrated Providers
  - Identification of the transmission and bridging components of the service for USF purposes
- Only a Rulemaking can Properly Provide an Industry Solution

---

**KELLEY**

**DRYE**

## **Retroactive Assessment Would Devastate CSPs With No Corresponding USF Benefit**

- Stand Alone CSPs Would Suffer Enormous Harm if USAC is Permitted to Assess Retroactively
  - They already paid USF surcharges to their IXC's in good faith, and IXC's will not voluntarily refund amounts paid
  - USAC contends that no statute of limitations applies, yet will not permit amendment of returns after more than one year
  - The accumulated assessments, penalties and interest far exceed the ability of nearly all stand alone CSPs to pay
  - Could indirectly extend the full panoply of federal and state common carrier regulation to a previously unregulated industry

---

**KELLEY**

**DRYE**

## **Retroactive Assessment Would Devastate CSPs With No Corresponding USF Benefit (cont'd)**

- The Harm Would Extend to IXC Suppliers as Well
  - Disrupt existing wholesale contracts and successful supplier-customer relationships
  - Endless litigation over the need to refund USF surcharge revenue
- USAC is Not Benefited by Retroactive Assessment
  - USF amounts due have already been paid, albeit indirectly
  - Only benefit would be an undeserved and unintended “double payment” windfall

---

KELLEY

DRYE

## **A Stay Is Appropriate While The Bureau Considers The Policy Issues**

- Until the FCC Provides Additional Guidance, USAC Should Not Upset Decades of Industry Practice
  - The FCC, not USAC, must set the policy
- Retroactive Application of the USAC Decision Would Cause Irreparable Harm
- Protracted Litigation with IXCs Over Refunds is not in the Public Interest
- Stand Alone and Integrated Providers Can Pay the Same Amount Under Current Rules, so the Balance of Harms Favors a Stay

---

**KELLEY**

**DRYE**